

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:

**Igra**

Application No.: 09/816,552

Filed: March 23, 2001

For: COMMON DESIGN FOR  
WEB PAGES THROUGH  
EMPLOYMENT OF  
MASTER SPECIFICATIONS

Examiner: Hutton, Jr., William D.

Art Unit: 2176

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited  
with the United States Postal Service as **First Class Mail** in  
an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,  
Washington, D.C. 20231 on this date:

November 13, 2006

DATE

Yvette L. Chriscaden

TYPED OR PRINTED NAME

/Yvette L. Chriscaden/

SIGNATURE

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

Dear Sir:

This is a resubmission of Applicant's Reply Brief dated January 11, 2006, submitted in response to the Examiner's resubmission of the Examiner's Answer dated December 8, 2005.

Appellant respectfully replies to the Examiner's answer as follows:

(A) In response to Appellant's argument that Ferrel does not disclose a "master specification specifying a common style, a common navigation arrangement, and common content placement for each resultant web page to be generated," the Examiner has maintained that Ferrel does disclose such a master specification in the form of Ferrel's collection of templates, controls, and style sheets.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's analogy. Even assuming for the sake of argument that such a collection specifies one common style,

navigation, and content placement, Ferrel fails to teach subordinate content specifications that reference the templates, controls, and style sheets “for style, navigation, and content placement,” as is claimed in claim 1 of the present application. Accordingly, it follows that the templates, controls, and style sheets can not serve as a master specification of the sort claimed in claim 1.

In the Answer and in the previous rejections, the Examiner identifies the content objects of Ferrel as reading upon the first and second “subordinate content specifications” of claim 1 (Answer pgs. 5 and 6). According to the Examiner, these story and photo objects, depicted as elements 462-466 in Figure 8 of Ferrel, reference “the associated control and corresponding style sheet” (Answer pg. 6) for common styling, navigation, and content placement. Applicant respectfully submits that this is a misreading of Ferrel. While Ferrel teaches story objects referencing style sheets (Ferrel, col. 19, lines 36-39), such style sheets do not provide common navigation, and are thus incapable of serving, alone, as the master specification of claim 1. To the extent that Ferrel provides any sort of navigation arrangement, such as the transitions between different page layouts cited by the Examiner (Answer pg. 5), it is the templates, controls, and content objects themselves (through hyperlinks) that provide the transitions, not the style sheets.

Ferrel, however, does not teach objects referencing “the associated control,” as asserted by the Examiner (Answer pg. 6). Rather, Ferrel teaches objects that are referenced by the controls, not objects that reference the controls. According to Ferrel, “each control delineates an area where some piece of content should be displayed. Settings on each control determine the proper place to look for the content to be displayed in that control” (col. 8, lines 52-55). Content objects are placed by the system of Ferrel into one or more containers (e.g., files), and the controls reference these containers to find and retrieve the content objects (see Ferrel, col. 9, lines 20-27). In addition to having controls reference containers which

store the content objects, Ferrel also teaches including on the page layouts static links to content objects, if those objects are of the sort that will not need to be regularly updated (col. 9, lines 47-52). Thus, Ferrel teaches both templates (page layouts) and controls that reference content objects. Nowhere, however, does Ferrel disclose content objects that reference controls.

Accordingly, neither the collection of templates, controls, and style sheets, nor any of those on its own or in sub-combination, teaches a “master specifications specifying a common style, a common navigation arrangement, and a common content placement,” the master specification being referenced by subordinate content specifications.

(B) In response to Appellant’s argument that Ferrel fails to teach a master specification specifying a common navigation arrangement, the Examiner asserts that navigation, as defined by Appellant’s Specification, has a broad meaning, encompassing “supported transitions between the web pages” (Answer pg. 5).

Appellant readily acknowledges the broad meaning given to the term “navigation” in Appellant’s Specification. Appellant’s disagreement with the Examiner, however, is not directed to the breadth of that term, but rather to the specifying of a common arrangement of navigation. Ferrel may, as the Examiner argues, support transitions between page layouts and content objects. However, Ferrel fails to disclose any common arrangement of these transitions.

In support of his contention, the Examiner cites column 18, line 63 through column 20, line 62 of Ferrel as disclosing two page layouts, “Page 1” and “Page 2” and states that Ferrel “supports transitions” between those pages. Ferrel may indeed support transitions, but this does not at all disclose, in as complete of detail as is claimed in claim 1, a “common navigation arrangement.”

Further, the Examiner states that common navigation “reads on any web page component that allows a user to navigate from one web page of a website to

another web page of the website” (Answer pg. 42). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner simply provides a definition of navigation between two pages of a web site, not a definition of a “common navigation arrangement.” Rather, a common navigation arrangement such as that specified by the Applicant would require that each page have the same arrangements for transitioning to other pages that every other page referencing the master specification has. While it may indeed be possible to utilize a common navigation arrangement in conjunction with the other teachings of Ferrel, no such arrangement is explicitly or inherently disclosed by that reference.

Accordingly, Ferrel fails to teach “a master specification specifying . . . a common navigation arrangement,” as is claimed in claim 1 of the present application.

#### Conclusion

As Applicant has set forth in the brief, the Examiner has erred in his rejections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner’s rejections.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Date: November 13, 2006

/Robert C. Peck/  
Robert C. Peck, Reg. No. 56,826  
Agent for Appellant

Pacwest Center  
1211 SW Fifth Ave., Ste 1600-1900  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Phone: (503) 222-9981,  
FAX: (503) 796-2900